



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/965,615	09/27/2001	Masakazu Hirano	09412.65876	7774	
7590 12/28/2004			EXAMINER		
Patrick G. Burns, Esq.			NEGRON, DANIELL L		
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD. Suite 2500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
300 South Wacl	ker Dr.	*	2651		
Chicago, IL 60606			DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004	DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/965,615	HIRANO ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniell L. Negrón	2651
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 22 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average in a rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	•	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ree have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office.	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply concept than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
iled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	'04(b).	
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR</li> </ol>		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) M they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s)	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	· / <del></del>	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NOT place the
<ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 2, 4-12 and 14-21.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on 22 November 2004	is a)⊠ approved or b)□ disa	approved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer		
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation</u> Sheet	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

Continuation of 10. Other: The amendment filed November 22, 2004 under 37 CFR 1.116 in reply to the final rejection has been considered but is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance and will not be entered because: The limitation "...wherein said arm is released from contact with a wall in a parking area by the head feed operation, and said arm is pushed against the wall in the parking area as the unload operation is completed..." as recited in proposed amendment of claims 1 and 11 raises new issues that would require further consideration and search.

SINHTRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

2